

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 27 and 30 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-32 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 27-32 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 27 and 30 have been amended in a manner consistent with the suggestion in the Office Action. Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 27 and claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 30. Applicants submit that the amended claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims as being directed to non-statutory subject matter be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 17-28, 30 and 31 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,408 issued to Kaku (*Kaku*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,599 issued to Cheney, et al. (*Cheney*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-13, 17-28, 30 and 31 are not rendered obvious by *Kaku* and *Cheney*.

The Office Action states:

The motivation for performing such a modification is Kaku is to be able to decode both past and future reference picture *before decoding the B-frame* as taught by Cheney...

See page 5 (emphasis added). Whether or not this is an accurate characterization, it is the reverse of the claimed invention which recites

decompressing the selected ***base frame prior to*** decompressing other frames of the group of frames...

Therefore, even if the characterization and motivation provided by the Office Action are correct, the resulting combination cannot teach or suggest the claimed invention because the combination achieves the reverse result. The independent claims include limitations similar to that cited above of decoding a base frame prior to decompressing other frames. This may allow, for example, the base frame to be displayed while the remaining frames are being decompressed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. Claims 6-13 depend from claim 5. Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21. Claim 28 depends from claim 27. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, 6-13, 16-13, 18-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30 and 31 are not rendered obvious by *Kaku* and *Cheney* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 4, 29 and 32 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Kaku* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0014748 A1 of Ben-David, et al. (*Ben-David*). *Kaku* discloses a technique for compressing and decompressing a single frame. See col. 1, lines 40-48. *Ben-David* is cited to teach MPEG and similar encoding techniques. The motivation provided by the Office Action is to be “less sensitive to DCT-based compression.” See page 7. However, if one were to switch encoding techniques for that purpose, *Kaku* would no longer be useful. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined *Kaku* and *Ben-David* to attempt to achieve the invention as claimed in claims 4, 29 and 32.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 14-16 were allowed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for identifying allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-32 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: June 29, 2007

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778